

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
10 AT SPOKANE

11  
12 PLUMBERS UNION LOCAL NO. 12  
13 PENSION FUND, Individually and on  
14 Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

15 Plaintiff,

16 vs.

17 AMBASSADORS GROUP INC.,  
18 JEFFREY D. THOMAS, CHADWICK  
19 J. BYRD and MARGARET M.  
THOMAS,

20 Defendants.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

No.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR  
VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL  
SECURITIES LAWS

1 Plaintiff has alleged the following based upon the investigation of Plaintiff's  
2 counsel, which included a review of United States Securities and Exchange  
3 Commission ("SEC") filings by Ambassadors Group Inc. ("Ambassadors Group" or  
4 the "Company"), as well as regulatory filings and reports, securities analysts' reports  
5 and advisories about the Company, press releases and other public statements issued  
6 by the Company, and media reports about the Company, and Plaintiff believes that  
7 substantial additional evidentiary support will exist for the allegations set forth herein  
8 after a reasonable opportunity for discovery.

### 9 NATURE OF THE ACTION

10 1. This is a federal class action on behalf of purchasers of the common stock  
11 of Ambassadors Group between February 8, 2007 and October 23, 2007, inclusive  
12 (the "Class Period"), seeking to pursue remedies under the Securities Exchange Act of  
13 1934 (the "Exchange Act").

### 14 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

15 2. The claims asserted herein arise under and pursuant Sections 10(b) and  
16 20(a) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. §§78j(b) and 78t(a)] and Rule 10b-5  
17 promulgated thereunder by the SEC [17 C.F.R. §240.10b-5].

18 3. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant  
19 to 28 U.S.C. §1331 and Section 27 of the Exchange Act.

20 4. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to Section 27 of the Exchange  
21 Act and 28 U.S.C. §1391(b). Many of the acts charged herein, including the  
22 preparation and dissemination of materially false and misleading information,  
23 occurred in substantial part in this District.

24 5. In connection with the acts alleged in this Complaint, Defendants,  
25 directly or indirectly, used the means and instrumentalities of interstate commerce,  
26

1 including, but not limited to, the mails, interstate telephone communications and the  
2 facilities of the national securities markets.

### 3 **PARTIES**

4 6. Plaintiff Plumbers Union Local No. 12 Pension Fund, as set forth in the  
5 accompanying certification and incorporated by reference herein, purchased the  
6 common stock of Ambassadors Group at artificially inflated prices during the Class  
7 Period and has been damaged thereby.

8 7. Defendant Ambassadors Group is incorporated in Delaware and  
9 maintains its headquarters at 1956 Ambassador Way, Spokane, WA 99224-4004. The  
10 Company, an educational company, organizes and promotes international and  
11 domestic travel programs for youth, athletes, and professionals.

12 8. (a) Defendant Jeffrey D. Thomas (“Jeff Thomas”) is, and was at all  
13 relevant times, President and Chief Executive Officer of Ambassadors Group.

14 (b) Defendant Chadwick J. Byrd (“Byrd”) is, and was at all relevant  
15 times, Chief Financial Officer, Principal Accounting Officer and Secretary of  
16 Ambassadors Group.

17 (c) Defendant Margaret M. Thomas (“Peg Thomas”) is, and was at all  
18 relevant times, Executive Vice President of Ambassadors Group. She is also the wife  
19 of Defendant Jeff Thomas.

20 (d) Defendants Jeff Thomas, Byrd and Peg Thomas are referred to  
21 herein as the “Individual Defendants.”

22 9. During the Class Period, the Individual Defendants, as senior executive  
23 officers and/or directors of Ambassadors Group, were privy to confidential and  
24 proprietary information concerning Ambassadors Group, its operations, finances,  
25 financial condition and present and future business prospects. The Individual  
26 Defendants also had access to material adverse non-public information concerning

1 Ambassadors Group, as discussed in detail below. Because of their positions with  
2 Ambassadors Group, the Individual Defendants had access to non-public information  
3 about its business, finances, products, markets and present and future business  
4 prospects via access to internal corporate documents, conversations and connections  
5 with other corporate officers and employees, attendance at management and/or board  
6 of directors meetings and committees thereof and via reports and other information  
7 provided to them in connection therewith. Because of their possession of such  
8 information, the Individual Defendants knew or recklessly disregarded that the  
9 adverse facts specified herein had not been disclosed to, and were being concealed  
10 from, the investing public.

11 10. The Individual Defendants are liable as direct participants in the wrongs  
12 complained of herein. In addition, the Individual Defendants, by reason of their status  
13 as senior executive officers and/or directors, were “controlling persons” within the  
14 meaning of Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act and had the power and influence to  
15 cause the Company to engage in the unlawful conduct complained of herein. Because  
16 of their positions of control, the Individual Defendants were able to and did, directly  
17 or indirectly, control the conduct of Ambassadors Group’s business.

18 11. The Individual Defendants, because of their positions with the Company,  
19 controlled and/or possessed the authority to control the contents of its reports, press  
20 releases and presentations to securities analysts and through them, to the investing  
21 public. The Individual Defendants were provided with copies of the Company’s  
22 reports and press releases alleged herein to be misleading, prior to or shortly after their  
23 issuance and had the ability and opportunity to prevent their issuance or cause them to  
24 be corrected. Thus, the Individual Defendants had the opportunity to commit the  
25 fraudulent acts alleged herein.

12. As senior executive officers and/or directors and as controlling persons of a publicly traded company whose common stock was, and is, registered with the SEC pursuant to the Exchange Act, and was, and is, traded on the NASDAQ National Market (“NASDAQ”) and governed by the federal securities laws, the Individual Defendants had a duty to promptly disseminate accurate and truthful information with respect to Ambassadors Group’s financial condition and performance, growth, operations, financial statements, business, products, markets, management, earnings and present and future business prospects, and to correct any previously issued statements that had become materially misleading or untrue, so that the market price of Ambassadors Group’s common stock would be based upon truthful and accurate information. The Individual Defendants’ misrepresentations and omissions during the Class Period violated these specific requirements and obligations.

13. The Individual Defendants are liable as participants in a fraudulent scheme and course of conduct that operated as a fraud or deceit on purchasers of Ambassadors Group’s common stock by disseminating materially false and misleading statements and/or concealing material adverse facts. The scheme: (i) deceived the investing public regarding Ambassadors Group’s business, operations and management and the intrinsic value of Ambassadors Group’s securities; (ii) enabled Individual Defendants Jeff Thomas and Peg Thomas and other Company insiders to sell 225,620 shares of their personally-held Ambassadors Group common stock for gross proceeds in excess of \$7.8 million; and (iii) caused Plaintiff and members of the Class to purchase Ambassadors Group’s common stock at artificially inflated prices.

#### **PLAINTIFF’S CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

14. Plaintiff brings this action as a class action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a) and (b)(3) on behalf of a class consisting of all those who

1 purchased the common stock of Ambassadors Group between February 8, 2007 and  
2 October 23, 2007, inclusive, and who were damaged thereby (the "Class"). Excluded  
3 from the Class are Defendants, the officers and directors of the Company, at all  
4 relevant times, members of their immediate families and their legal representatives,  
5 heirs, successors or assigns and any entity in which Defendants have or had a  
6 controlling interest.

7       15. The members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all members is  
8 impracticable. Throughout the Class Period, Ambassadors Group common stock was  
9 actively traded on the NASDAQ. While the exact number of Class members is  
10 unknown to Plaintiff at this time and can only be ascertained through appropriate  
11 discovery, Plaintiff believes that there are hundreds or thousands of members in the  
12 proposed Class. Record owners and other members of the Class may be identified  
13 from records maintained by Ambassadors Group or its transfer agent and may be  
14 notified of the pendency of this action by mail, using the form of notice similar to that  
15 customarily used in securities class actions.

16       16. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the Class as  
17 all members of the Class are similarly affected by Defendants' wrongful conduct in  
18 violation of federal law complained of herein.

19       17. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of  
20 the Class and has retained counsel competent and experienced in class action and  
21 securities litigation.

22       18. Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Class  
23 and predominate over any questions solely affecting individual members of the Class.  
24 Among the questions of law and fact common to the Class are:

25               (a) whether the federal securities laws were violated by Defendants'  
26 acts as alleged herein;

(b) whether statements made by Defendants to the investing public during the Class Period misrepresented material facts about the business and operations of Ambassadors Group;

(c) whether the price of Ambassadors Group common stock was artificially inflated during the Class Period; and

(d) to what extent the members of the Class have sustained damages and the proper measure of damages.

19. A class action is superior to all other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy since joinder of all members is impracticable. Furthermore, as the damages suffered by individual Class members may be relatively small, the expense and burden of individual litigation make it impossible for members of the Class to individually redress the wrongs done to them. There will be no difficulty in the management of this action as a class action.

#### **SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS**

20. Defendant Ambassadors Group describes itself as a “leading educational travel and online educational research organization that organizes and promotes international and domestic travel programs for students, athletes, and professionals, and provides nearly 8.4 million pages of online content.”

21. The Class Period begins on February 8, 2007. On that date, Ambassadors Group issued a press release announcing its financial results for the fourth quarter and year end of 2006, the period ended December 31, 2006. For the quarter, the Company reported a net loss of \$5.4 million, or \$0.26 loss per share. Defendant Jeff Thomas commented on the results, stating, in pertinent part, as follows:

We are pleased with our 2006 financial results. We have continued to operate and build a business that offers unique, life-changing and globally beneficial travel programs to motivated and achievement-oriented delegates. In 2006, we traveled to 40 countries and had students from 70 countries participate in our domestic programs. This global reach enriches the lives of those who experience our programs.



1 At the same time, our operating success has continued to create value for  
2 our shareowners.

3 During the year just ended, we generated \$26.7 million in net income  
4 and \$37.2 million in operating cash flow. We then returned \$18.4 million  
5 in cash to shareowners through our cash dividend and share buyback  
6 programs. Subsequent to year-end, we have already deployed \$35.5  
7 million to buy back 6.3% of shares outstanding. The net impact of these  
8 capital deployment efforts has resulted in Ambassadors returning \$53.9  
9 million to our shareowners since the beginning of 2006.

10 We will continue to seek opportunities to maximize shareowner returns  
11 through capital deployment, as well as continuing to grow our company.

12 22. On February 9, 2007, Ambassadors Group held a conference call with  
13 analysts and investors to discuss the Company's earnings and operations, among other  
14 things. With regard to the Company's outlook for 2007, Defendant Peg Thomas  
15 stated, in pertinent part, as follows:

16 For 2007, we're off to a good start. As of February 1, 2006, we had net  
17 enrollments of slightly over 47,800 delegates. On the same date for 2007,  
18 we currently have 60,600 delegates enrolled. These are already net of  
19 withdrawals to date. We have continued to move forward and make  
20 progress on a number of operational fronts.

21 For a few examples, we have approximately 30% of our delegates will  
22 be traveling on new programs in 2007. Our social networking website is  
23 up and running for our alumni travelers and they are utilizing it as a  
24 place to go to discuss their past and prospective program experiences.

25 We have continued to increase our travelers to Asia, a growing market,  
26 but also a growing American interest in this region for us. We have a  
new sports festival in Vienna this year that will operate in July of 2007  
and we have students participating from over 70 countries on our U.S.  
program, where the visitors stay on seven prestigious college campuses.

We're looking forward to the challenges and excitement that our  
growing organization will encounter in 2007. . . .

Defendant Byrd stated, in pertinent part, as follows:

For 2007, we are confident that the 27% increase in enrollments will lead  
to stronger growth on both the top and bottom line than experienced in  
2006. Earnings per share and returns on equity will further benefit from  
the repurchase of approximately 1.3 million shares of stock early in  
2007.



1 In response to a question regarding the 27% increase in enrollment, Defendant Jeff  
2 Thomas stated:

3 TERRY O'CONNOR, ANALYST, CEDAR CREEK MANAGEMENT:  
4 In fact, this is Terry. But asking this another way, if you look at your  
5 ultimate delegates traveled last year versus your February 1, '06 number,  
6 you lost about 10% from there in your ultimate count. If you'd do the  
7 same kind of number, you still get -- I understand what you're saying.  
8 There's timing differences.

9 But the previous questioner was asking about don't you need to find lots  
10 of new delegates just to make 15%. And it's hard to get that answer out  
11 of these numbers. It sure seems like you're going to be somewhere  
12 between 15% and 27% unless the wheels fall off.

13 JEFF THOMAS: Terry, we agree with you. It's a stronger 27% year over  
14 year than last year. I think that's what you're asking. In terms of last year  
15 being comparable with a different time in the campaign, kind of what we  
16 see. And there's several different moving parts there. We think it's going  
17 to be a strong growth year in 2007 than we had in 2006.

18 23. On April 23, 2007, Ambassadors Group issued a press release  
19 announcing its financial results for the first quarter of 2007, the period ended March  
20 31, 2007. For the quarter, the Company reported an operating loss of \$8.5 million, or  
21 \$0.25 loss per share. Defendant Jeff Thomas commented on the announcement,  
22 stating, in pertinent part, as follows:

23 We are pleased to report our first quarter results for 2007. As planned,  
24 we are reporting a loss for the quarter of \$0.25 per share, as we prepare  
25 for our two most significant revenue quarters, the second and third  
26 quarters. In the first quarter of 2007, we traveled approximately 3,000  
delegates, compared to 1,950 in the first quarter of 2006.

We also continued to deploy capital back to our shareholders. This  
quarter, we deployed \$35.6 million to repurchase 1.3 million shares of  
our stock. Virtually all of our first quarter stock repurchases were  
executed at a negotiated price of \$27.46 per share. At the same time, our  
first quarter operating results include increased marketing and  
development spending as we prepare for and invest in 2008 programs.

At this point in the year, we are working to retain those delegates that  
have already enrolled in 2007 programs, complete preparations for future  
program delivery and ensure that our programs continue to be operated  
in a high quality manner. Thank you for your continued support.

1        24. On April 24, 2007, Ambassadors Group held a conference call with  
2 analysts and investors to discuss the Company's earnings and operations. With regard  
3 to the Company's first quarter results and outlook for the rest of the year, Defendant  
4 Jeff Thomas stated, in pertinent part, as follows:

5        As many of you know, the first quarter of the year is typically a seasonal  
6 loss for our organization, and this year is no exception, as we incurred a  
7 \$0.25 loss for the quarter just ended. But let me tell you what's different  
8 about this quarter compared to the same quarter one year ago.

9        First, we traveled 3,000 delegates this year compared to 2,000 last year.  
10 So far this year, in the first quarter we have purchased just under 1.3  
11 million of our own shares compared to 60,000 one year ago.

12        We are at our lowest deployable cash point since March of 2002, when  
13 we spun off from Ambassadors International. This has allowed us to slim  
14 down our balance sheet, continue to drive the return in equity number.

15        And we have 56,000 delegates enrolled to travel or already traveled  
16 compared to roughly 45,000 last year at this time. These numbers  
17 position us well for 2007. . . .

18 Defendant Peg Thomas stated, in pertinent part, as follows:

19        As we discussed earlier in the year, the headlines for 2007 are the  
20 organic growth of our program, continued introduction of new  
21 itineraries, and a stabilization of our withdrawal rate. We are executing  
22 upon this plan.

23        The current enrollments for 2007 including those already traveled to date  
24 are 56,400. One year ago, this number was 45,300. These numbers  
25 reflect enrollments for all four product lines.

26        New programs comprise about 30% of our current enrollments for 2007,  
and we define a new program as one that is less than three years old. We  
closed 2006 with a withdrawal rate of 32%. We believe 2007 will end  
the year within this range.

      Right now, we have two key areas of operational focus. We have just  
completed our leadership programs in Washington D.C. as well as  
preparing for the international departures that begin in five weeks.

Defendant Byrd stated, in pertinent part, as follows:

      For those of you looking to see how this year will play out, our growth  
pattern is different than in years past.

1 First of all, we expect a higher weighting of delegates to travel with us in  
2 the third quarter than in the second quarter. This means that 60% of our  
projected growth will take place in the second half of the year.

3 Second, our expense base is increasing more than in years past and being  
4 incurred earlier. For 2007, you will see a larger percent of expenses  
being incurred in the first half of the year.

5 Overall, we are confident that the 25% increase in enrollments and  
6 increased participant deposits will lead to stronger growth on both the  
top and bottom line than experienced in 2006.

7 Earnings per share and returns on equity will further benefit from the  
8 \$35.6 million repurchase of 1.3 million shares of stock earlier in 2007.  
Thank you for your time today. I will now turn the call back to Jeff.

9 In response to a question about marketing expenses, Defendants Byrd and Jeff  
10 Thomas stated:

11 NICK ANDERSON: Good morning. My first question is, it looks like  
12 selling and marketing expenses have increased roughly \$500,000  
sequentially from December to March -- whereas, they typically decline  
13 sequentially by \$1.5 million. I was hoping you could explain the change.

14 CHADWICK BYRD: Yes, this year we've -- we're bringing in some  
selling and marketing programs, not only for 2008, but also for 2007. So  
15 the largest increase that you see there is primarily for the 2007 programs.

16 \* \* \* \*

17 GERRY HEFFERNAN, ANALYST, LORD ABBETT AND  
COMPANY: Hello, thank you. Sorry for being repetitive here, but as the  
18 first person had an interesting question about the expenses increasing  
from the fourth quarter sequentially and I have to be honest. I really did  
19 not fully understand your answer, if you could just review that again.

20 CHADWICK BYRD: Sure, so in 2007 we incurred some program costs  
that normally would have been incurred in the previous quarter, but we  
21 took those into 2007. We're trying to decrease the amount in which - the  
time period in which we incur expenses and then receive those revenues.

22 So for 2007, that is what you are seeing in the first quarter.

23 GERRY HEFFERNAN: So you're saying the fourth quarter actually was  
24 lower than it would have been per the way you were doing business in  
previous years.

25 JEFF THOMAS: That is one way to look at it, yes.  
26

1        25. On July 23, 2007, Ambassadors Group issued a press release announcing  
2 its financial results for the second quarter of 2007, the period ended June 30, 2007.  
3 For the quarter, the Company reported net income of \$20.9 million, or \$1.05 fully  
4 diluted earnings per share. Defendant Jeff Thomas commented on the announcement,  
5 stating, in pertinent part, as follows:

6        We are pleased to report results for this quarter that continue to keep us  
7 on track for our long term financial and operational targets. For the  
8 second quarter of 2007, we have traveled 22,380 delegates, compared to  
9 19,200 delegates in the same quarter one year ago. This increase in our  
10 delegate count led to a 22 percent increase in our net revenue, from  
11 \$35.2 to \$42.9 million. This top line growth has enabled us to realize a  
12 22 percent increase in our earnings per share for the second quarter, from  
13 \$0.86 to \$1.05. Operationally, we continue to develop and implement  
14 unique programs that consistently score very highly on our postprogram  
15 evaluation surveys.

16        Once again, we were challenged by geopolitical events. This time, we  
17 had to contend with the foiled plots in the United Kingdom, which,  
18 although highly publicized, had a negligible impact on peoples'  
19 decisions to travel with us. We did activate our response team and  
20 communicate to families, teachers and students about what was  
21 happening and what we were doing about it. This is a standard part of  
22 our operations at this point.

23        After deploying \$40.1 million of capital back to our shareowners in the  
24 form of share buybacks and dividends in the first six months of 2007, our  
25 balance sheet has continued to strengthen. We continue to be debt free  
26 and have \$33.7 million in deployable cash.

27        26. On July 24, 2007, Ambassadors Group held a conference call with  
28 analysts and investors to discuss the Company's earnings and operations. With regard  
29 to the Company's second quarter results and its outlook for the remainder of the year,  
30 Defendant Jeff Thomas stated, in pertinent part, as follows:

31        And for the second quarter we're pleased to report that we have traveled  
32 approximately 25,400 delegates in the first six months of 2007 compared  
33 to 21,100 over the first six months of 2006.

34        Earnings after tax were nearly \$21 million in the second quarter  
35 compared to \$18.5 million for the same quarter one year ago. After  
36 reaching the low point in our balance sheet last quarter, we are  
37 rebuilding our strength in this area with over \$37 million in deployable  
38 cash.

1 As many of you know, we have a high degree of seasonality in our  
2 operations. The seasonality is driven by a couple of things. First, we  
3 recognize revenue when our delegates actually travel and the vast  
4 majority of our delegates travel in the second and third quarters, so we  
5 recognize the majority of our revenue over the second and third quarters.  
6 In addition, our operating expenses have seasonality as well due to  
7 marketing campaigns that occur in different parts of the year. At this  
8 point in time, in fact, nearly all of our marketing spending is for  
9 programs that depart in 2008, with spending occurring now to  
10 accommodate that growth. As a result, the first and fourth quarters are  
11 loss quarters. The second and third quarters are the highest revenue,  
12 highest earnings quarters.

13 Along with this seasonality, our key operating ratios will fluctuate, such  
14 as gross margin and operating margins although we are on track to  
15 realize our planned numbers along both these dimensions this year.  
16 Based on these factors, I want to highlight three things that are different  
17 about our second quarter at this point. First, we still have over 27,000  
18 delegates enrolled, but not yet traveled for the rest of 2007. We have  
19 students from over 100 countries participating in our programs and there  
20 was another foiled terrorist plot in London, much like last summer,  
21 although at this point the impact on our operations and enrollments is  
22 minimal.

23 So far we're still on track against plan at this point in terms of delegates  
24 to travel as well as key operating ratios. These numbers position us well  
25 for the remainder of 2007. . . .

26 Defendant Peg Thomas stated, in pertinent part, as follows:

27 We are reporting record numbers for the quarter. This quarter we  
28 traveled 22,400 delegates in comparison to 19,200 one year ago in the  
29 same period. ***Our second focus this time of year is our marketing  
30 campaigns for 2008. We are in the process of launching these  
31 campaigns right now. The campaigns are similar in timing and  
32 delivery as previous years.***

33 And that brings us to the remainder of the year. In terms of enrollments  
34 for the entire year of 2007, we currently have net enrollments of 53,300  
35 for 2007. This number one year ago was 43,500. These numbers include  
36 those delegates that have already traveled year-to-date. So of the 53,300  
37 we have already traveled 25,382, which we have 27,900 remaining to  
38 travel in this calendar year. That's if we do not have any more  
39 withdrawals off that number. [Emphasis added.]

40 In response to a question about withdrawals, Defendant Peg Thomas stated:

41 GREG MCKINLEY: Okay. And so you shared with us some numbers on  
42 your net enrollments, I think you said 53,300 as opposed to 43,500 at the  
43 same point in time last year, which would imply another just shy of  
44 maybe 27,900 yet to travel. I noticed, I guess, based on that 43,500 last  
45 year, we ended up travelling 43,100. Should we expect some withdrawal



1 rates in that 300 to 400 student range in the back half to get us to where  
2 our annual number will be? Or what are your expectations around what  
3 you're seeing with withdrawal rate trends and expected travelers for the  
4 full year?

5 PEG THOMAS: We're expecting about that same trend, Greg. So it's  
6 similar to how you laid it out, that's about where we are too. We'll have  
7 some more enrollments come in this year, but mostly we'll see -- we'll  
8 start to see it change where we get net withdrawals this time of year. So  
9 that 27,900, obviously, we'd love to travel every one of them, but we  
10 will have some withdrawals in that number.

11 \* \* \* \*

12 ERIC WOODWORTH, ANALYST, DSM: Hi, good morning. Thanks  
13 for the time today. Just a couple of questions here. Kind of related to the  
14 attrition rates, it sounds like the attrition rates have kind of stabilized  
15 relative to Q1 and kind of the second half of '06. Is that fair to say? Or  
16 have they continued to --?

17 PEG THOMAS: By attrition rate, you mean withdrawal rate?

18 ERIC WOODWORTH: Yes, yes.

19 PEG THOMAS: Yes. So year-over-year, they have stabilized in terms of  
20 -- I think we closed the year, 2006, at around 32% and we think we'll  
21 end up at about that at the end of 2007.

22 In response to a question regarding the Company's mail campaigns, Defendants Byrd  
23 and Peg Thomas stated, in pertinent part, as follows:

24 GREG MCKINLEY: Okay. The headquarters relocation, I know you're  
25 making some investments there, I believe around direct marketing  
26 production, bringing that in-house. Can you talk a little bit about that and  
27 what type of cost savings or efficiency pay-backs you expect to earn  
28 from that?

29 CHADWICK BYRD: Yes, I mean we're -- probably won't get into the  
30 minutia of the detail on that, but certainly we did invest in some  
31 equipment that allows us to in-source our mail campaigns. That  
32 investment, obviously, we wouldn't have done if we didn't think it was  
33 going to pay off. And we are seeing that.

34 The equipment is up and functioning and doing quite well with the kick-  
35 off of our 2008 programs now. So we're excited about that investment  
36 and what it's going to return to the organization.

37 PEG THOMAS: And, Greg, I'll add to that. Partly by doing it, obviously  
38 it was a long-term investment, but it's also a quality investment for us  
39 because as you get larger and you have to have so many more mailings,  
40 and fulfillment mailings after students and families become part of our

1 delegations, that quality was really important to us and we wanted to  
2 control a lot of that.

3 In response to questions regarding the Company's outlook, Defendant Byrd stated:

4 MIMI NOEL, ANALYST, SIDOTI AND COMPANY: Hi. Chadwick, I  
5 think I just have two for you. Would you please repeat that gross margin  
6 guidance? It sounded a little confusing to me.

7 CHADWICK BYRD: All right. So gross margin as a percent of our  
8 program receipts is expected to be consistent with what we had in 2006,  
9 which was just over 35%. And also consistent with this quarter's gross  
10 margin percent, which is just over 35%.

11 \* \* \* \*

12 MIMI NOEL: Okay. And the top-line growth that you provided was, and  
13 the bottom line growth, was better than where you were last year? As far  
14 as growth rates go? Is that correct?

15 CHADWICK BYRD: That's correct, but I also said that 45% of our  
16 earnings came, last year, came in the second, in the second half. And we  
17 expect that to be higher in the second half for 2007.

18 \* \* \* \*

19 GREG MCKINLEY: Hey guys, I just wanted to make sure I understood  
20 some of your guidance comments regarding your outlook for 46% to  
21 49% of fiscal year earnings to occur in the second half of the year. That -  
22 - if I just do the numbers right that seems to me like you've essentially  
23 taken down your earnings growth guidance for the year. I know that  
24 earnings grew roughly 18% or 19% in '07.

25 But if we take the \$16 million of net income you've earned to date and  
26 apply, I guess, what would be 51% to 54% you're indicating, as it would  
represent of the fiscal year, we start getting to maybe like a range of  
\$29.5 to \$31.5 million of net income, which is definitely below that 18%  
or 19% growth range that was generated last year. And I think your prior  
comments were that earnings growth this year would exceed earnings  
growth last year. Can you just help me understand how to interpret that?

CHADWICK BYRD: Yes, so I think we're obviously maybe splitting  
hairs on this one, but on our -- if you look at our earnings per share, we  
were also at 19%. We expect it to be higher than that this year. A lot of  
that's coming through the repurchase of shares from Invemed so that had  
a -- is having a decreasing impact on our net income, but it's increasing  
impact on earnings per share.

GREG MCKINLEY: Okay. So -- okay. Are you -- so you are expecting,  
in terms of operating earnings then. I don't know, I just sense that I  
didn't -- wasn't sure that that was the context that that guidance was



1 originally made in the first half. I thought it was not only in terms of  
2 EPS, but also in terms of net income. Is that --?

3 CHADWICK BYRD: Yes, that's correct.

4 GREG MCKINLEY: So you have somewhat moderated the second half  
5 outlook for operating earnings growth?

6 CHADWICK BYRD: I think it's been moderated a bit, yes, yes, yes.

7 GREG MCKINLEY: And is that largely just due to the marketing  
8 initiatives or -- I mean, because it seems like the flow through on the top  
9 line is remaining quite healthy.

10 CHADWICK BYRD: No, that's correct.

11 27. In response to the earnings announcement and the subsequent conference  
12 call, shares of the Company's stock rose \$3.08 per share, or approximately 10%, over  
13 the next two trading days – to close at \$35.19 per share on July 25, 2007.

14 28. The statements referenced above in ¶¶21-26 were materially false and  
15 misleading when made because they misrepresented and failed to disclose the  
16 following adverse facts, which were known to Defendants or recklessly disregarded  
17 by them:

18 (a) that the Company was experiencing a lower conversion rate from  
19 people attending its informational meetings to booking travel;

20 (b) that there was a decrease in the number of enrolled participants for  
21 the Company's 2008 travel programs, especially in its international outbound  
22 programs;

23 (c) that the Company had utilized a different database in order to  
24 promote its travel programs to prospective clients; and

25 (d) as a result of the foregoing, Defendants lacked a reasonable basis  
26 for their positive statements about the Company and its prospects.

27 29. Then, on October 22, 2007, Ambassadors Group issued a press release  
28 announcing its financial results for the third quarter of 2007, the period ending

1 September 30, 2007. For the quarter, the Company reported net income of \$22.5  
 2 million and \$1.12 fully diluted earnings per share. The Company also announced that  
 3 “as of October 16, 2007, its net enrolled participants for 2008 travel programs were  
 4 26,200 compared to 37,300 participants as of the same date last year for its 2007  
 5 programs” and that the “decrease in net enrollments for its 2008 programs will  
 6 negatively impact its 2008 earnings.” Defendant Thomas commented on the results,  
 7 stating, in pertinent part, as follows:

8 The global challenges we met in the past travel seasons, however, have  
 9 been replaced with current economic challenges. The dollar continues to  
 10 weaken against most major currencies while fuel prices and airline fuel  
 11 surcharges continue to hit all-time highs. These inflationary pressures on  
 12 future program costs, combined with the under-performance of one of  
 13 our name sources and the current economic uncertainty, creates a  
 14 challenging environment in which to market our programs. We anticipate  
 15 that we will not achieve the same earnings in 2008 as in 2007; however,  
 16 the 2008 enrollments and projections are new and based upon developing  
 17 information. We are taking measures to mitigate these negative effects.

18 30. On October 23, 2007, Ambassadors Group held a conference call with  
 19 analysts and investors. With regard to the Company’s outlook for 2008, Defendant  
 20 Jeff Thomas stated, in pertinent part, as follows:

21 Third, I want to discuss the outlook for 2008. As many of you know, our  
 22 marketing for travel in 2008 ramps up considerably after Labor Day. We  
 23 start to get our first early indicators for next year in late September and  
 24 early October based upon the results from our information meetings and  
 25 resulting enrollments.

26 This is my 13th Fall here and our early indicators for revenue growth in  
 2008 are not good. In fact, this is only the second time in these 13 Falls  
 that I have been looking at a year-over-year revenue decline. The other  
 was 2001, in the wake of 9/11. The situation is reflected in our balance  
 sheet, where participants’ deposits are down approximately 27%. In  
 addition, net enrollments for next year are at roughly 25,800 compared to  
 roughly 36,000 at the same time last year.

These numbers will, of course, impact our revenue results for 2008,  
 although it is too early to provide meaningful guidance. We can,  
 however, make the following statements. We will have less revenue in  
 2008 than 2007. Although at this point in time, we cannot give a precise  
 number or range. To the extent that our revenue is down in 2008, net  
 income will likely be down even more as our operating leverage will be  
 working against us. Again, we cannot give a precise number or range, it

1 is too early to tell. To better exemplify what I am talking about, for  
 2 example, if our sales end up being down 15%, our net income will be  
 down more than 15%.

3 \* \* \* \*

4 We are researching and analyzing the drivers of this decline. Right now,  
 5 we believe the following -- there are a number of external factors  
 6 working against the people deciding to enroll their children in travel  
 7 programs that cost over \$5,000, including -- the weak U.S. dollar is  
 adding to the cost of the program. The high cost of oil fuel is adding to  
 the cost of airline tickets. In fact, in many cases, the same program year-  
 over-year has seen tuition increase by more than 10%, putting many of  
 our programs in the \$6,000 range.

8 In addition, the wealth effect, whereby a key discretionary spending is  
 9 driven by the value of peoples' homes is having an adverse impact on  
 10 people considering buying our programs. And this is the first time in  
 years that many people have seen the value of their homes stagnate or  
 decline.

11 We also believe that part of the decline is driven by an unexpected  
 12 decline in the performance of one of our named databases or sources of  
 13 names. We are disciplined about testing elements of our direct marketing  
 14 campaign before rolling them out on a national scale. So this database  
 was tested prior to this fall and performed considerably better in the test  
 than in the rollout this fall.

15 Defendant Peg Thomas added:

16 For the 2008 marketing campaign, Jeff mentioned in his opening that the  
 17 enrollments to date for 2008 are 26,200 delegates in comparison to  
 18 37,300 one year ago on the comparable date. For the 2008 marketing  
 campaigns, our enrollments are down by close to that 30% on a year-  
 over-year comparison.

19 We believe this decline can be attributed to the higher fuel prices and a  
 20 weak dollar, and therefore a higher program price than a year ago, a  
 decline in performance of one of our mailing lists, and the weakened  
 U.S. economy.

21 31. In response to this announcement, the price of Ambassadors Group  
 22 common stock fell \$17.73 per share, or approximately 44%, to close at \$21.04 per  
 23 share, on unusually heavy trading volume.

24 32. The market for Ambassadors Group common stock was open, well-  
 25 developed and efficient at all relevant times. As a result of these materially false and  
 26 misleading statements and failures to disclose, Ambassadors Group common stock

1 traded at artificially inflated prices during the Class Period. Plaintiff and other  
2 members of the Class purchased or otherwise acquired Ambassadors Group common  
3 stock relying upon the integrity of the market price of Ambassadors Group common  
4 stock and market information relating to Ambassadors Group, and have been damaged  
5 thereby.

6 33. During the Class Period, Defendants materially misled the investing  
7 public, thereby inflating the price of Ambassadors Group's common stock, by  
8 publicly issuing false and misleading statements and omitting to disclose material  
9 facts necessary to make Defendants' statements, as set forth herein, not false and  
10 misleading. Said statements and omissions were materially false and misleading in  
11 that they failed to disclose material adverse information and misrepresented the truth  
12 about the Company, its business and operations, as alleged herein.

13 34. At all relevant times, the material misrepresentations and omissions  
14 particularized in this Complaint directly or proximately caused, or were a substantial  
15 contributing cause of, the damages sustained by Plaintiff and other members of the  
16 Class. As described herein, during the Class Period, Defendants made or caused to be  
17 made a series of materially false or misleading statements about Ambassadors  
18 Group's business, prospects and operations. These material misstatements and  
19 omissions had the cause and effect of creating in the market an unrealistically positive  
20 assessment of Ambassadors Group and its business, prospects and operations, thus  
21 causing the Company's common stock to be overvalued and artificially inflated at all  
22 relevant times. Defendants' materially false and misleading statements during the  
23 Class Period resulted in Plaintiff and other members of the Class purchasing the  
24 Company's common stock at artificially inflated prices, thus causing the damages  
25 complained of herein.

### Additional Scienter Allegations

35. As alleged herein, Defendants acted with scienter in that Defendants knew that the public documents and statements issued or disseminated in the name of the Company were materially false and misleading; knew that such statements or documents would be issued or disseminated to the investing public; and knowingly and substantially participated or acquiesced in the issuance or dissemination of such statements or documents as primary violations of the federal securities laws. As set forth elsewhere herein in detail, Defendants, by virtue of their receipt of information reflecting the true facts regarding Ambassadors Group, their control over, and/or receipt and/or modification of Ambassadors Group's allegedly materially misleading misstatements and/or their associations with the Company which made them privy to confidential proprietary information concerning Ambassadors Group, participated in the fraudulent scheme alleged herein.

36. Defendants were further motivated to engage in this course of conduct in order to allow Individual Defendants Jeff Thomas and Peg Thomas and other Company insiders to sell 225,620 shares of their personally-held Ambassadors Group common stock for gross proceeds in excess of \$7.8 million. The following chart sets forth the insider trading:

Insider	Date	Shares	Price	Proceeds
DALE FREY	5/25/2007	12,500	\$33.80	\$422,500
	5/25/2007	3,838	\$33.50	\$128,573
		16,338		\$551,073
JEFFREY THOMAS	6/4/2007	51,000	\$33.89	\$1,728,390
	8/8/2007	2,512	\$39.13	\$98,295
	8/8/2007	2,000	\$39.10	\$78,200
	8/8/2007	600	\$39.70	\$23,820
	8/10/2007	100	\$39.09	\$3,909
	8/13/2007	28,900	\$39.06	\$1,128,834
		85,112		\$3,061,448
MARGARET THOMAS	5/9/2007	13,170	\$33.95	\$447,122
	5/22/2007	500	\$33.70	\$16,850

	5/24/2007	20,500	\$33.15	\$679,575
		34,170		\$1,143,547
JOHN UEERROTH	2/23/2007	6,000	\$30.40	\$182,400
	2/23/2007	1,999	\$30.48	\$60,930
	2/23/2007	1,241	\$30.46	\$37,801
	2/23/2007	359	\$30.41	\$10,917
	2/23/2007	200	\$30.42	\$6,084
	2/23/2007	200	\$30.43	\$6,086
	2/23/2007	1	\$30.51	\$31
	4/30/2007	5,500	\$33.10	\$182,050
	4/30/2007	3,300	\$33.00	\$108,900
	4/30/2007	600	\$33.03	\$19,818
	4/30/2007	500	\$33.02	\$16,510
	4/30/2007	100	\$33.04	\$3,304
	5/9/2007	4,200	\$33.70	\$141,540
	5/9/2007	2,000	\$33.80	\$67,600
	5/9/2007	2,000	\$33.90	\$67,800
	5/9/2007	1,900	\$33.91	\$64,429
	5/9/2007	1,500	\$33.63	\$50,445
	5/9/2007	1,500	\$33.81	\$50,715
	5/9/2007	700	\$33.77	\$23,639
	5/9/2007	200	\$33.64	\$6,728
	5/9/2007	200	\$33.85	\$6,770
	5/9/2007	200	\$33.89	\$6,778
	5/9/2007	100	\$33.66	\$3,366
	5/9/2007	100	\$33.67	\$3,367
	5/9/2007	100	\$33.71	\$3,371
	5/9/2007	100	\$33.74	\$3,374
	5/9/2007	100	\$33.82	\$3,382
	5/9/2007	100	\$33.92	\$3,392
	6/14/2007	4,600	\$33.20	\$152,720
	6/14/2007	4,484	\$33.10	\$148,420
	6/14/2007	4,100	\$33.27	\$136,407
	6/14/2007	1,708	\$33.04	\$56,432
	6/14/2007	1,597	\$33.07	\$52,813
	6/14/2007	1,592	\$33.08	\$52,663
	6/14/2007	1,300	\$33.25	\$43,225
	6/14/2007	1,100	\$33.21	\$36,531
	6/14/2007	1,019	\$33.01	\$33,637
	6/14/2007	900	\$33.24	\$29,916
	6/14/2007	900	\$33.28	\$29,952
	6/14/2007	800	\$33.09	\$26,472
	6/14/2007	300	\$33.05	\$9,915
	6/14/2007	300	\$33.06	\$9,918
	6/14/2007	100	\$33.02	\$3,302
	6/14/2007	100	\$33.03	\$3,303
	6/14/2007	100	\$33.22	\$3,322
	8/1/2007	4,600	\$38.50	\$177,100



1		8/1/2007	400	\$38.52	\$15,408
2		8/1/2007	100	\$38.54	\$3,854
3		8/1/2007	100	\$38.55	\$3,855
4		8/1/2007	100	\$38.57	\$3,857
5		8/1/2007	100	\$38.58	\$3,858
6		8/1/2007	3,454	\$38.60	\$133,324
7		8/1/2007	2,200	\$38.65	\$85,030
8		8/1/2007	2,400	\$38.67	\$92,808
9		8/1/2007	5,646	\$38.70	\$218,500
10		8/1/2007	900	\$38.76	\$34,884
11		8/1/2007	2,400	\$38.83	\$93,192
12		8/1/2007	2,000	\$38.88	\$77,760
13		8/1/2007	600	\$38.89	\$23,334
14		8/1/2007	1,700	\$38.90	\$66,130
15		8/1/2007	1,300	\$38.91	\$50,583
16		8/1/2007	2,000	\$38.93	\$77,860
17			90,000		\$3,131,813
18					
19		<b>Total:</b>	<b>225,620</b>		<b>\$7,887,880</b>

### Loss Causation/Economic Loss

37. During the Class Period, as detailed herein, Defendants engaged in a scheme to deceive the market and a course of conduct that artificially inflated the prices of Ambassadors Group common stock and operated as a fraud or deceit on Class Period purchasers of Ambassadors Group common stock by failing to disclose to investors that the Company was experiencing weakness in its travel programs. When Defendants' prior misrepresentations and fraudulent conduct were disclosed and became apparent to the market, the price of Ambassadors Group common stock fell precipitously as the prior artificial inflation came out. As a result of their purchases of Ambassadors Group common stock during the Class Period, Plaintiff and the other Class members suffered economic loss, *i.e.*, damages, under the federal securities laws.

38. By failing to disclose to investors that the Company was experiencing weakness in its travel programs, Defendants presented a misleading picture of Ambassadors Group's business and prospects. Defendants' false and misleading statements had the intended effect and caused Ambassadors Group common stock to



1 trade at artificially inflated levels throughout the Class Period, reaching as high as  
2 \$40.99 per share on October 18, 2007.

3 39. As a direct result of Defendants' disclosure on October 22, 2007, the  
4 price of Ambassadors Group common stock fell precipitously, falling by \$17.73 per  
5 share, or 44%. This drop removed the inflation from the price of Ambassadors Group  
6 common stock, causing real economic loss to investors who had purchased  
7 Ambassadors Group common stock during the Class Period.

8 40. The 44% decline in the price of Ambassadors Group common stock after  
9 this disclosure came to light was a direct result of the nature and extent of Defendants'  
10 fraud finally being revealed to investors and the market. The timing and magnitude of  
11 the price decline in Ambassadors Group common stock negates any inference that the  
12 loss suffered by Plaintiff and the other Class members was caused by changed market  
13 conditions, macroeconomic or industry factors or Company-specific facts unrelated to  
14 Defendants' fraudulent conduct. The economic loss, *i.e.*, damages, suffered by  
15 Plaintiff and the other Class members was a direct result of Defendants' fraudulent  
16 scheme to artificially inflate the prices of Ambassadors Group common stock and the  
17 subsequent significant decline in the value of Ambassadors Group common stock  
18 when Defendants' prior misrepresentations and other fraudulent conduct were  
19 revealed.

20 **Applicability of Presumption of Reliance:**  
21 **Fraud on the Market Doctrine**

22 41. At all relevant times, the market for Ambassadors Group's common stock  
23 was an efficient market for the following reasons, among others:

24 (a) Ambassadors Group common stock met the requirements for  
25 listing, and was listed and actively traded on the NASDAQ, a highly efficient and  
26 automated market;

1 (b) as a regulated issuer, Ambassadors Group filed periodic public  
2 reports with the SEC and the NASDAQ;

3 (c) Ambassadors Group regularly communicated with public investors  
4 via established market communication mechanisms, including through regular  
5 disseminations of press releases on the national circuits of major newswire services  
6 and through other wide-ranging public disclosures, such as communications with the  
7 financial press and other similar reporting services; and

8 (d) Ambassadors Group was followed by several securities analysts  
9 employed by major brokerage firms who wrote reports which were distributed to the  
10 sales force and certain customers of their respective brokerage firms. Each of these  
11 reports was publicly available and entered the public marketplace.

12 42. As a result of the foregoing, the market for Ambassadors Group common  
13 stock promptly digested current information regarding Ambassadors Group from all  
14 publicly available sources and reflected such information in the prices of the stock.  
15 Under these circumstances, all purchasers of Ambassadors Group common stock  
16 during the Class Period suffered similar injury through their purchase of Ambassadors  
17 Group common stock at artificially inflated prices and a presumption of reliance  
18 applies.

### 19 No Safe Harbor

20 43. The statutory safe harbor provided for forward-looking statements under  
21 certain circumstances does not apply to any of the allegedly false statements pleaded  
22 in this complaint. Many of the specific statements pleaded herein were not identified  
23 as “forward-looking statements” when made. To the extent there were any forward-  
24 looking statements, there were no meaningful cautionary statements identifying  
25 important factors that could cause actual results to differ materially from those in the  
26 purportedly forward-looking statements. Alternatively, to the extent that the statutory

1 safe harbor does apply to any forward-looking statements pleaded herein, Defendants  
2 are liable for those false forward-looking statements because at the time each of those  
3 forward-looking statements were made, the particular speaker knew that the particular  
4 forward-looking statement was false, and/or the forward-looking statement was  
5 authorized and/or approved by an executive officer of Ambassadors Group who knew  
6 that those statements were false when made.

7 **COUNT I**

8 **Violation of Section 10(b) of**  
9 **the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5**  
10 **Promulgated Thereunder Against All Defendants**

11 44. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained above  
12 as if fully set forth herein.

13 45. During the Class Period, Defendants disseminated or approved the  
14 materially false and misleading statements specified above, which they knew or  
15 deliberately disregarded were misleading in that they contained misrepresentations  
16 and failed to disclose material facts necessary in order to make the statements made,  
17 in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading.

18 46. Defendants: (a) employed devices, schemes, and artifices to defraud; (b)  
19 made untrue statements of material fact and/or omitted to state material facts  
20 necessary to make the statements not misleading; and (c) engaged in acts, practices,  
21 and a course of business which operated as a fraud and deceit upon the purchasers of  
22 the Company's common stock during the Class Period.

23 47. Plaintiff and the Class have suffered damages in that, in reliance on the  
24 integrity of the market, they paid artificially inflated prices for Ambassadors Group  
25 common stock. Plaintiff and the Class would not have purchased Ambassadors Group  
26 common stock at the prices they paid, or at all, if they had been aware that the market  
prices had been artificially and falsely inflated by Defendants' misleading statements.

1 48. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful conduct,  
2 Plaintiff and the other members of the Class suffered damages in connection with their  
3 purchases of Ambassadors Group common stock during the Class Period.

4 **COUNT II**

5 **Violation of Section 20(a) of**  
6 **the Exchange Act Against the Individual Defendants**

7 49. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained above  
8 as if fully set forth herein.

9 50. The Individual Defendants acted as controlling persons of Ambassadors  
10 Group within the meaning of Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act as alleged herein. By  
11 reason of their positions as officers and/or directors of Ambassadors Group, and their  
12 ownership of Ambassadors Group stock, the Individual Defendants had the power and  
13 authority to cause Ambassadors Group to engage in the wrongful conduct complained  
14 of herein. By reason of such conduct, the Individual Defendants are liable pursuant to  
15 Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act.

16 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff prays for relief and judgment, as follows:

17 A. Determining that this action is a proper class action, designating Plaintiff  
18 as Lead Plaintiff and certifying Plaintiff as a Class representative under Rule 23 of the  
19 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Plaintiff's counsel as Lead Counsel;

20 B. Awarding compensatory damages in favor of Plaintiff and the other Class  
21 members against all Defendants, jointly and severally, for all damages sustained as a  
22 result of Defendants' wrongdoing, in an amount to be proven at trial, including  
23 interest thereon;

24 C. Awarding Plaintiff and the Class their reasonable costs and expenses  
25 incurred in this action, including counsel fees and expert fees; and

26 D. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury.

DATED: July 14, 2009

s/Karl P. Barth

KARL P. BARTH, WSBA No. 22780  
LOVELL MITCHELL & BARTH, LLP  
911 Western AVE, Suite 308  
Seattle, WA 98104  
Telephone: 206/432-8330  
206/432-8331 (fax)

COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER  
RUDMAN & ROBBINS LLP  
SAMUEL H. RUDMAN  
DAVID A. ROSENFELD  
MARIO ALBA, JR.  
58 South Service Road, Suite 200  
Melville, NY 11747  
Telephone: 631/367-7100  
631/367-1173 (fax)

ROBERT M. CHEVERIE &  
ASSOCIATES  
GREGORY CAMPORA  
Commerce Center One  
333 E. River Drive, Suite 101  
East Hartford, CT 06108  
Telephone: 860/290-9610

Attorneys for Plaintiff